



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,520	12/22/2000	Aman Gupta	GMES8081.045	4205

27061 7590 10/04/2003

ZIOLKOWSKI PATENT SOLUTIONS GROUP, LLC (GEMS)
14135 NORTH CEDARBURG ROAD
MEQUON, WI 53097

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,520

Applicant(s)

GUPTA ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen T Le

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments regarding Klatt et al have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because "the database categories" lack antecedent basis.

The art rejection of claim 31 is applied as best understood in light of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-7, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Christensen et al (US 2002/0156694).

Regarding claim 1, Christensen discloses a method for displaying real-time status of product availability (see the abstract). The claimed "automatically querying...otherwise" is met by the fact that the method of Christensen monitors the actual progress of the assembly of a product (see 0045). The claimed "for each product...is available" and "displaying a listing...availability management" are met by the fact that the method of Christensen status of the inventory is supervised via the inventory database (see 0046-0056).

Regarding claim 2, Christensen discloses querying the database for a number of orders, product category and sales revenue, adding and displaying as claimed (see 0044).

Regarding claim 3, the claimed "displaying the number of days until the product is available for shipment" is met when Christensen discloses that actual progress of the assembly of a product is monitored (see 0045-0056).

Regarding claim 4, the claimed "creating a plurality...is available" is met when Christensen shows the production/assembly/shipping module (see Figure 4).

Claims 5, 6 merely read on the fact that a product changes to "ready for shipment" in the logistics system via a user interface upon completion (see 0045).

Claim 7 merely reads on the fact that the method of Christensen monitors the actual progress of the product assembly (see 0045).

Regarding claim 22, Christensen discloses displaying when the product is available to customers when Christensen shows customer tracking of the shipment (see 0046).

Claim 23 merely differs from claim 1 by adding the orders, product category and sales revenue. Christensen discloses all the claimed limitations (see 0044-0056).

Regarding claim 24, Christensen discloses the display categories includes a product status (see 0045).

Regarding claim 25, Christensen discloses automatically querying in real time when Christensen shows continuously or periodically supervising the actual inventory (see 0046).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 8-21, 26-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christensen et al (US 2002/0156694), in view of Parad (US 5,369,570).

Claims 8, 16 essentially recite a computer program product and signal for claim 1 with the added limitations of using temporary tables to store the number of days, accessing and updating the temporary tables. Although Christensen does not specifically show the use of temporary tables, it is well known in the art to use temporary tables for storing data during a continuous scheduling process as shown by Parad (see Figure 7, column 6, lines 20-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed features while implementing the

computer program product of Christensen in order to maintain continuous update as actual progress is being monitored.

Claim 9 is met when Christensen shows planning and assembly schedule (see Figure 1).

Claims 10, 11, 12, 13 recite the same limitations of claims 2, 4, 5, 6 thus are rejected for the same reasons discussed in claims 2, 4, 5, 6 above.

Claims 14, 15 are met when Christensen shows querying the inventory system (see 0053).

Claim 17, 18, 21 recite the same limitations of claims 9, 12, 15, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 9, 12, 15 above.

Regarding claims 19, 20, since users' requirements vary, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed intervals depending on users' application.

Claims 26, 30 correspond respectively to a method and system of claim 8, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 8 above.

Regarding claim 27, clearly the temporary tables are updated following a change since they store actual progress monitored continuously.

Regarding claim 28, Christensen teaches the concept of automatically querying the database for orders, inventory and revenue (see 0044, 0045, 0046).

Regarding claim 29, Christensen discloses that the regular time can be adjusted when Christensen shows continuously or periodically monitoring the system (see 0046).

Claim 31 merely recites a database for the limitations of claim 1, lines 7-9. Clearly the information has to be stored in the system of Christensen for querying purpose.

Regarding claim 32, the claimed actual shipping date has to be included in the shipping system of Christensen (see Figure 1, item 129).

Regarding claim 33, the claimed "displaying the number of days until the product is available for shipment" is met when Christensen discloses that actual progress of the assembly of a product is monitored (see 0045-0056).

Regarding claim 34, Christensen discloses an Intranet server for providing results to internal users (see 0051).

Regarding claim 35, Christensen discloses an Internet server for providing results to customers and potential customers (see Figure 1).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Peachey-Kountz et al (US 6,463,345) teach regenerative available to promise.

Lau et al (US 5,905,496) teach workflow product navigation system.

Kehnemuyi et al (US 4,975,841) teach reporting customer data.

Martin et al (US 6,292,784) teach on-time delivery, tracking and reporting.

Sandoval (US 6,345,259) teach integrating business and manufacturing environment.

Dietrich et al (US 6,032,121) teach proactive planning.

Kumar et al (US 2002/0042756) teach managing ATP data in distributed supply chain.

Jenkins et al (US 2002/0188499) teach ensuring order fulfillment.

Breitenbach et al (US 2002/0016729) teach scheduling events and associated products and services.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Uyen Le
Primary Examiner
AU 2171

26 September 2003